

REMARKS

The objection to the drawings is noted, but reconsideration is requested. Paragraph 3 indicates that a pair of electrodes is claimed. The electrodes in the illustrated embodiment would correspond to the electrode 12 and the line 20.

Claim 1 was rejected over Wicker citing page 1, paragraph 12, for the proposition that Wicker teaches increasing the likelihood that the breakdown of a breakdown layer will occur in one region rather than another region of the breakdown layer. The cited material in Wicker does not support locating preferentially the breakdown region in any particular region of a breakdown layer. In fact, paragraph 12 of Wicker does not even talk about a breakdown layer. It is not known what is believed to be a breakdown layer in Wicker and there most certainly is nothing which preferentially causes breakdown at any particular region.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1, based on Wicker, is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was rejected under Section 102 as anticipated by Tsukamoto. It is suggested that Tsukamoto teaches that the breakdown layer 5 in Figure 1D is an implant pointing to 6 in Figure 1B. There is no 6 in Figure 1B, but there is an implant indicated at 7. But, at the time of the implant (shown in Figure 1B), the breakdown layer 5 has not even been formed, so it cannot possibly be implanted. The material 6 in Figure 1E is also asserted in the office action to be the electrode and so it cannot possibly be denominated to be the ion implanted breakdown layer.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 was rejected under Section 103 over Wicker in view of Tsukamoto. Again, it is asserted that Tsukamoto teaches the implanted breakdown layer. As discussed above, reconsideration is requested since Tsukamoto does not implant any breakdown layer.

Claim 23 calls for increasing the likelihood that the breakdown will occur in one region, rather than another region of said breakdown layer. The rejection based on Wicker is deficient for the reasons described above.

Claim 26 and its dependent claims were allowed.

Therefore, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 22, 2005



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation